United Nations A/C.3/57/SR.53

General Assembly
Fifty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 December 2002

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 53rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 19 November 2002, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein)

Contents

Agenda item 104: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 109: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

02-70248 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 104: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.73 and L.74)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.73: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Ms. G/Mariam** (Ethiopia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.73 and announced that Chile and Norway had joined the sponsors.

2. **The Chairman** said that Croatia, Japan, Panama, Suriname and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had also become sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.74: New international humanitarian order

3. **Mr. Goussous** (Jordan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.74 and announced that Thailand had become a sponsor. The text was inspired partly by previous General Assembly resolutions, including 55/73, 53/124 and 51/74, and partly by the report of the Secretary-General in document A/57/583.

4. There were a number of revisions to the draft resolution. The fifth preambular paragraph should be deleted, since it was simply a quotation from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "a culture of compliance and" should be deleted. Paragraph 2 should be revised to reflect the exact language used in the Secretary-General's report, and should therefore read: "*Calls upon* Governments to provide expertise and the necessary means to identify the building blocks of such an order and agenda, plan the architecture and undertake the required supplementary activities". A new paragraph, originally paragraph 2 of resolution 55/73, should be inserted after paragraph 2 (and the remaining paragraphs renumbered) reading: "*Invites* the Secretary-General to continue to promote strict adherence to refugee law, international humanitarian law, human rights instruments and internationally accepted norms and principles in situations of armed conflict and complex emergencies". The words "as well as adjustment to new realities" should be deleted from paragraph 4.

5. **The Chairman** said that Ecuador and Suriname had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 109: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.41, L.45, L.46, L.52, L.53, L.58, L.59, L.60, L.62, L.63, L.64, L.66, L.69 and L.70)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.70: Khmer Rouge trials

6. **Mr. Haraguchi** (Japan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that two technical revisions should be made to the text. In the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "hereinafter referred to as Extraordinary Chambers" should be inserted in brackets after the words "within the existing court structure of Cambodia" and, in paragraph 1, the words "to establish the Extraordinary Chambers" should be replaced with "on the establishment of the Extraordinary Chambers".

7. General Assembly resolution 56/169 on the situation of human rights in Cambodia had urged the Government of Cambodia and the United Nations to conclude an agreement without delay so that the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia for the Prosecution of Crimes Committed during the Period of Democratic Kampuchea could start to function promptly. However, the Secretary-General had announced, in February 2002, that the United Nations had withdrawn from the negotiations and, subsequently, that he needed a clear mandate from either the General Assembly or the Security Council before engaging in further negotiations. The draft resolution had been prepared in response to that request, with a view to bringing to trial those responsible for atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge.

8. There were four important points to consider: firstly, that future negotiations would be based on previous negotiations; secondly, that the jurisdiction of the Extraordinary Chambers must remain consistent with international commitments undertaken by the

Government of Cambodia; thirdly, that the draft resolution was designed to provide a clear framework for the United Nations to conduct negotiations and, lastly, that the text must be acceptable to the Government of Cambodia. The process was vitally important for the reconciliation of the Cambodian people, as well as for the United Nations, which had made the protection of human rights one of its major priorities. Since the Government had expressed its support for the text, the onus lay on the international community to adopt the resolution, thus opening the way for credible Khmer Rouge trials. Failing that, the chance for cooperation in that regard between the Government of Cambodia and the United Nations would be lost forever.

9. **Mr. Ouch** Borith (Cambodia) endorsed the draft resolution as the basis for further negotiations and expressed optimism that negotiations would resume shortly.

10. **Mr. Floreani** (France) said that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote, in order to expedite the negotiations and bring the Khmer Rouge leaders to justice as soon as possible.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.41: Human rights and cultural diversity

11. **Mr. Alaei** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that Ecuador and Swaziland had joined the sponsors. Prolonged consultations had taken place with the United States and other delegations with a view to resolving disagreement over the sixth preambular paragraph. While a revised version had eventually been accepted by the sponsors, he expressed concern that the text agreed upon at the fifty-sixth session had needed to be changed at all. The revised paragraph should read: "*Welcoming also* the contribution of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, held at Durban, South Africa, from 31 August to 8 September 2001, to the promotion of respect for cultural diversity".

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.41, as orally revised, was adopted.*

13. **Ms. Patterson** (Canada) said that, although it had joined the consensus, her delegation would have preferred a more balanced reference to the World Conference, taking into account elements that might have had a negative impact on efforts to promote cultural diversity.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.45: Human rights education

14. **The Chairman** announced that the delegations of Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Mali, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, and that it contained no programme-budget implications.

15. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that human rights education should be seen as a key to development. The draft resolution aimed to promote human rights as a way of life, by taking a highly participatory approach to education, and stressing the interdependence of all human rights. The delegations of Thailand and Togo had joined the sponsors.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.45 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.46: Missing persons

17. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications, and that Burundi, Croatia the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Mauritania, the Sudan, Suriname and Yugoslavia had joined the sponsors.

18. **Ms. Ibrahimova** (Azerbaijan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that Belarus had also become a sponsor.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.46 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.52: Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights

20. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

21. **Mr. Maertens** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Cyprus, Liechtenstein and Sweden had joined the sponsors. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

22. **The Chairman** announced that Morocco wished to join the sponsors.

23. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.52 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.53: Human rights and extreme poverty

24. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

25. **Mr. Chuquihuara** (Peru), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Argentina, Austria, Cuba, Cyprus, Finland, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America had joined the sponsors, and pointed out that the name of Tunisia had been wrongly omitted from the original list of sponsors. He wished to make three minor revisions to the text: in the eleventh preambular paragraph, the words "for the enjoyment of human rights" should be deleted. The thirteenth preambular paragraph should finish after the words "mutually reinforcing", and paragraph 6 should read "*Recognizes* the need to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in order to address the most pressing social needs of people living in poverty including through the design and development of appropriate mechanisms to strengthen and consolidate democratic institutions and governance".

26. **The Chairman** announced that Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Colombia, Germany, Hungary, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mauritania, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wished to join the sponsors.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.53, as orally revised, was adopted.*

28. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt) said that his delegation had not wanted to prevent the draft resolution from being adopted by consensus as a mark of its appreciation for the efforts of the main sponsor. Nevertheless, Egypt still believed that there was a strong link between poverty and democracy and, in that connection, felt that it was unfortunate that the references to that linkage had been deleted from the draft resolution. The fight against poverty, especially the eradication of extreme poverty, could contribute substantially to the promotion and consolidation of democracy and constituted a common and shared responsibility of States.

29. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said that, by adopting the draft resolution on the right to food at the previous session, the Third Committee had acknowledged the right of poor people to be empowered. She congratulated those responsible for preparing the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.58: Promotion of the right of peoples to peace

30. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

31. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) appealed to the members of the Committee to support the draft resolution, as it reaffirmed the right of all peoples to peace. He informed the Committee that Ethiopia was not a sponsor of the draft resolution.

32. **The Chairman** announced that a recorded vote had been requested.

33. **Mr. von Kaufmann** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution reiterated several provisions of the United Nations Declaration of the Right of Peoples to Peace. The four delegations had questions and concerns about, inter alia, the content of the right to peace and the specific obligations of States to guarantee it, which had not been addressed by the draft resolution. Furthermore, the text focused on relations between States rather than on their obligation to respect human rights, and referred to such issues as international peace and security, disarmament and arms control which were more appropriately dealt with in other forums.

34. He lamented the fact that another draft resolution from the Commission on Human Rights had been included in the agenda of the Third Committee (A/C.3/57/L.58), since that practice undermined efforts to streamline the work of the General Assembly. He was also disappointed at the lack of transparency surrounding the introduction of the draft resolution: Cuba had not been prepared to engage in negotiations on the text. For all those reasons, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America would be voting against the draft resolution and encouraged other delegations to do the same.

35. **Ms. Eskjær** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the associated countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey and, in addition, Iceland and Norway, said those delegations believed that the primary issues raised in the draft resolution were better addressed in

forums other than the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights, since neither of those bodies had the competence to deal with them.

36. The draft resolution addressed the relationship between States and did not consider the core mandate of the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights, namely the relationship between the State and its citizens and the exercise by individuals of their human rights. The European Union was also uncomfortable with the idea of a "right to peace", given that such a right had not been established in any international human rights instrument. Therefore, the European Union would be voting against the draft resolution.

37. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Madagascar, Malawi, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.58 was adopted by 90 votes to 50, with 14 abstentions.*

39. **Ms. Morgan** (Mexico) said that her delegation had frequently reiterated its commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes and the need for general and complete disarmament, and had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, she felt that the Third Committee and the Commission on Human Rights were not the appropriate forums in which to discuss the draft resolution and that doing so distorted the work of the relevant competent human rights bodies. Her delegation therefore reserved the right to change its position.

40. **Ms. Tomar** (India) said that her delegation had abstained from the voting, since it considered that the Third Committee was not the appropriate forum in which to discuss issues relating to disarmament.

41. **Mr. Moussotsi** (Gabon) said that he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution had he been present.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.59: Respect for the purposes and principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms and in solving international problems of a humanitarian character

42. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

43. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Belarus had joined the sponsors. He drew attention to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution and expressed his delegation's conviction that the United Nations was the proper forum in which to find peaceful solutions to international humanitarian

problems. He appealed to the members of the Committee to support the draft resolution.

44. **The Chairman** announced that Jamaica, Malawi and Suriname wished to join the sponsors. He said that a recorded vote had been requested.

45. **Ms. Eskjær** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the associated countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey and, in addition, Iceland and Norway in explanation of vote before the voting, reaffirmed the commitment of the European Union to the purposes and principles of the Charter, in particular with regard to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, which lay within the competence of the Third Committee. However, concerns about the draft resolution expressed by the European Union in previous years still stood. The Union could not support the selective use of the principles contained in the Charter and did not believe that a text solely based on the Charter could contribute to the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, or that adopting the text would contribute to the achievement of the aims of the Charter.

46. The European Union had previously cooperated in a positive spirit in order to produce a resolution which addressed issues of relevance to the Third Committee and which did not impinge on debates taking place elsewhere in the United Nations system. However, it appeared that its efforts to improve the text had been unsuccessful.

47. The members of the European Union believed that the draft resolution did not present an accurate picture of cooperation in the field of human rights or contribute to the solution of problems in the humanitarian field. It would merely duplicate work carried out under other agenda items and did not add value to the work of the Third Committee. The European Union would therefore be voting against it.

48. **Ms. Dempster** (New Zealand) said that New Zealand continued to be guided by the Charter in the area of the promotion of human rights. However, the draft resolution selectively interpreted those rights in order to imply that State sovereignty should be promoted over and above other objectives of the United Nations.

49. Although New Zealand respected the principle of national sovereignty, it also recognized that that principle did not prejudice the other provisions of the Charter concerning the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security. The draft resolution sought to limit the role of the United Nations in the area of human rights and humanitarian action and contradicted the broad objectives of the Charter. For those reasons, New Zealand would vote against it.

50. **Mr. von Kaufman** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and the United States of America, said that the draft resolution raised important questions already being addressed in other forums within the United Nations, and that consideration of the text was not a constructive use of the limited time available to the Third Committee. Member States were obliged to respect the spirit of the Charter and its purposes and principles, and the reinforcement of those purposes and principles constituted a recognition that human rights were the legitimate concern of the international community.

51. However, rather than embracing the spirit of the Charter, the draft resolution aimed to limit its scope. By means of selective and unbalanced citations from the Charter and other international instruments, it focused on national sovereignty rather than on human rights, and incorrectly suggested that sovereignty was a shield behind which human rights violations could be perpetrated with impunity. It also failed to reflect the fact that the Charter made it clear that, in certain circumstances, concerns for international peace and security could override State sovereignty.

52. The international community should seek ways of working together in the spirit of the Charter rather than implementing divisive initiatives. Consequently, the three delegations would be voting against the draft resolution, and encouraged others to do the same.

53. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon,

Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Fiji, Guatemala, Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Thailand, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

54. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.59 was adopted by 93 votes to 51, with 17 abstentions.*

55. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba) said that the voting had highlighted the fact that members of the international community had differing opinions about how to cooperate in the humanitarian field. Despite all his delegation's efforts, it had proved impossible to reach a consensus on the draft resolution, but Cuba was always open to new suggestions and hoped that new opportunities to discuss the question would arise in the future.

56. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said that she had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it called for the promotion of human rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.60: Protection of migrants

57. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

58. **Mr. Simancas Gutiérrez** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Haiti, Mali, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, the Sudan and Suriname had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. He introduced a revision of paragraph 3, which would read: "*Calls upon* States to fully promote and protect the human rights of migrants, as contained in the Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance".

59. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.60, as orally revised, was adopted.*

60. **Mr. Loh** Tuck Keat (Singapore), explaining his delegation's position on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.60, said that his country respected migrants' contributions to its society and, mindful of its responsibilities towards them, gave both permanent and temporary migrants the same protection as citizens. However, immigration policies were perforce governed by countries' special circumstances. Social harmony in a small, crowded country with a heterogeneous population of four million living in an urban environment called for a careful balance among their varying interests. In any event, immigration policies fell within each State's sovereign jurisdiction. Although it had joined the consensus, his delegation reserved the right to reconsider its position subsequently.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.62: Hostage-taking

61. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

62. **Mr. Nikiforov** (Russian Federation), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, joined by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, introduced a technical revision whereby the phrase "in strict conformity with international human rights standards" should be inserted between the words "order" and "to" in the last preambular paragraph, so as

to bring it into line with Commission on Human Rights resolution 2001/38.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.62, as orally revised, was adopted.*

64. **Ms. Grollová** (Czech Republic) said her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because of the revision introduced by the sponsors, although her Government believed that its language and content suggested that its proper forum would have been the Security Council or the Commission on Human Rights. Should the same draft resolution be introduced the following year, her delegation would ask the sponsors to hold broad consultations with a view to bringing the language more into line with the Committee's agenda, which was the protection of human rights.

Draft resolution 63: Strengthening of the rule of law

65. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications and that Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Togo and Yugoslavia had joined the list of sponsors.

66. **Mr. El-Eryani** (Yemen) said that, owing to a misunderstanding, his delegation had been added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.63 and not A/C.3/57/L.68, as it had requested. He requested that the error should be corrected.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.63 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.64: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

68. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

69. **Mr. Ndimeni** (South Africa), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, expressed the hope that other delegations would join the list of sponsors.

70. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Kazakhstan.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.64 was adopted by 106 votes to 51, with 1 abstention.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.66: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

72. **The Chairman** announced that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

73. **Mr. Ndimeni** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, thanked delegations for their contributions that had made consensus possible.

74. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.66 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.69: Respect for the right to universal freedom of travel and the vital importance of family reunification

75. **Ms. González Fraga** (Cuba), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, joined by Ecuador, exhorted all delegations to support it.

76. **Ms. Costa** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that paragraph 1 targeted her country's regulations concerning Cuban government officials' travel in the United States, a bilateral matter between the two countries. The United States supported the portions of the draft resolution that endorsed universal freedom of travel and family reunification and called on all countries, including Cuba, to do likewise.

77. It was ironic that Cuba had introduced the draft resolution, as it continued to severely restrict its own citizens' international travel. Examples included the denial of exit visas to medical professionals in possession of documents for emigration to the United States to join their families, and to a well-known Cuban opposition leader to travel to the Republic of Korea to attend a democracy forum. Most immigrants to the United States, one of the world's largest immigrant countries, arrived through family reunification, which her country facilitated through its immigration law. It objected to the punitive economic provisions and other arbitrary measures some countries imposed on would-be emigrants.

78. Her delegation would willingly consider a draft resolution on freedom to travel and family reunification, but would vote against the text as it stood.

79. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia.

80. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.69 was adopted by 86 votes to 2, with 71 abstentions.*

81. **Ms. Morgan** (Mexico) said her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because its content was important for migrants' exercise of their human rights. Freedom of travel, a right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, applied to all persons regardless of their citizenship status.

82. **Ms. Ramírez** (Costa Rica), endorsing the remarks by the previous speaker, said that the draft resolution should have made specific mention of the right contained in article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to the effect that

everyone had the right to leave any country, including his own.

83. **Ms. Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said that her delegation, unswerving in its support for universal respect of human rights, had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it aimed at protecting the rights of all migrants.

84. **Ms. González Fraga** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution was not intended to be bilateral, and enjoined all States, especially host countries, to promote integration and family reunification and to refrain from placing restrictions on family remittances. She pointed out that United States citizens travelled freely to Cuba.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.